UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/017,905	12/14/2001	Paul M. Ridker	B0801/7238 (ERG/KA)	7653

7590 01/05/2005

Edward R. Gates
Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.
Federal Reserve Plaza
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, MA 02210

EXAMINER	
NOLAN, PATRICK J	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1644	

DATE MAILED: 01/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/017,905	RIDKER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Patrick J. Nolan	1644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 September 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,5-7,11,12,15-17,21 and 52-61* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1, 2, 5-7, 11-12, 15-17, 21, 52-61* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/12/03
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, claims 1-7, 11-17, 21-27, and 31-37, now pending claims 1-2, 5-7, 11-12, 15-17, 21 and 52-61, drawn to a method of diagnosing a person for future diabetes or diabetic complication by detecting in C-reactive protein in the reply filed on 9-10-04 is acknowledged.

2. Claims 21 and 52 have been examined as they read upon the elected invention, detecting CRP and its use in determining the benefit of drug therapy use in diabetes treatment.

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1-2, 5-7, 11-12, 15-17, 21 and 52-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Applicant's invention is drawn to detecting CRP in pre-diabetic patients, comparing that value obtained to a predetermined value and if the value is high enough in the patient sample the person is at risk in developing diabetes and then accordingly treat said person. However, reviewing the specification, the comparing step, one that is critical in the determination of future diabetic risk has no set value. The specification clearly discloses on page 19, lines 6-10, that the patient sample is to be compared against a "Predetermined value specific for the diagnosis of diabetes or diabetic complications, as used herein, refers to a value that was not known previously to be associated with diabetes or diabetic complications". How does one of skill in the art practice the invention when there is no control to compare the patient's sample against, to be able to predict future diabetes. The claim requires the obtained value to be compared against a predetermined value specific for the diagnosis of diabetes, however this value is not known previously to be associated with diabetes. If the value was not known previously, what good is it to compare the obtained value with a value that has no known previous association with diabetes.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1-2, 5-7, 11-12, 15-17, 21 and 52-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Where applicant acts as his or her own lexicographer to specifically define a term of a claim contrary to its ordinary meaning, the written description must clearly redefine the claim term and set forth the uncommon definition so as to put one reasonably skilled in the art on notice that the applicant intended to so redefine that claim term. *Process Control Corp. v. HydReclaim Corp.*, 190 F.3d 1350, 1357, 52 USPQ2d 1029, 1033 (Fed. Cir. 1999). The term "predetermined value" in claims 1 and 21 is used by the claim to mean "a value not known to be associated with diabetes risk", while the accepted meaning is "it was already determined to be associated with diabetes." The term is indefinite because the specification does not clearly redefine the term.

It is unclear what applicant is wishing to claim. It appears from the specification Applicant wants to define the claimed invention so as to exclude prior art recognition of CRP values and diabetes risk, but does not want to define the claim with a lower limit value, above which CRP detection indicates diabetes risk. The claim has no metes and bounds because Applicant appears to want to define the claim by what was known in the prior art, rather than by a defined value. It is suggested Applicant amend their claim as follows "A method for characterizing an apparently healthy individual's risk profile of developing diabetes or diabetic complications, comprising: obtaining a blood level of C-reactive protein in the individual and if said level is greater than about 0.30mg/dl, than said individual has an increased risk of developing future diabetes or diabetic complications"

It is also noted that there is no correlation step between said obtaining of the value and whether or not the individual has a risk in developing diabetes.

7. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

8. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick Nolan whose telephone number is 571-272-0847.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan, can be reached at 571-272-0841.

Patrick J. Nolan, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner, Group 1640
November 29, 2004